



JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM

STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LANSING



THOMAS D. WATKINS, JR
SUPERINTENDENT OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Education

FROM: Thomas D. Watkins, Jr

DATE: March 4, 2004

SUBJECT: Approval of Criteria for Allocation of 2003 Title I School Improvement Funds

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 requires states to reserve two percent of the Title I funds allocated to the state to support improvement efforts in Title I schools identified as not making Adequate Yearly Progress. At least ninety-five percent (95%) of the reserved funds must be allocated to school districts for support to identified schools, with priority given to the lowest-achieving schools. The list of identified schools was made public on January 30, 2004. The required support funding should be made available to districts through a rigorous application process.

Michigan has \$5,000,000 in reserved Title I funds that must be used before the fall of 2004 to support high priority schools identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring. Staff in the Office of School Improvement recommend that these funds be ear-marked for districts with the 110 Title I schools currently identified for **Restructuring** because they have failed to make adequate yearly progress for the last five or more years. Schools in this phase are required to develop a plan for fundamental reform of the school's governance structure, with participation by teachers and parents, and prepare to implement the plan no later than the beginning of the next school year.

If all of the 110 schools apply for the funds available for their restructuring efforts, each would receive approximately \$45,000 to be used to support the option they select among the list available to them in the Restructuring phase. School districts will need to apply for these funds and provide clear rationale for the restructuring option selected, details on how they would plan for the option's implementation, a plan for professional development that would support the option for each of the schools for which they are requesting funds. All schools must use external expertise to assist them in their activities.

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

KATHLEEN N. STRAUS - PRESIDENT • HERBERT S. MOYER - VICE PRESIDENT
CAROLYN L. CURTIN - SECRETARY • JOHN C. AUSTIN - TREASURER
MARIANNE YARED MCGUIRE - NASBE DELEGATE • ELIZABETH W. BAUER
REGINALD M. TURNER • EILEEN LAPPIN WEISER

608 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909
www.michigan.gov/mde • (517) 373-3324

Printed by members of:



Attachment A, "Criteria for Allocation of 2003 Title I School Improvement Funds," provides background information and the proposed criteria for the grant. Attachment B entitled, "Guidelines for Corrective Action and Restructuring Options," outlines more specific criteria in the application process.

It is recommended that the State Board of Education approve the criteria for allocation of 2003 Title I school improvement funds to districts with Title I schools identified for Restructuring, as attached to the Superintendent's memorandum dated March 4, 2004.

**MICHIGAN
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

Criteria for 2003 Title I School Improvement Funds

The State Board of Education has adopted as its Strategic Goal

*Attain substantial and meaningful improvement in academic achievement
for all students/children, with primary emphasis on high priority schools and students.*

In addition, the State Board has adopted the following five strategic initiatives to implement the goal:

- o Ensuring Excellent Educators
- o Elevating Educational Leadership
- o Embracing the Information Age
- o Ensuring Early Childhood Literacy
- o Integrating Communities and Schools

To the extent possible, all grant criteria and grant awards will include priority consideration of the Strategic Goal and Initiatives.

BACKGROUND/PURPOSE OF GRANT

☐ Competitive ☒ Formula ☒ New ☐ Continuation (check all that apply)

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 requires states to reserve two percent of the Title I funds allocated to the state to support improvement efforts in Title I school identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. At least ninety-five percent of the reserved funds must be allocated to school districts for support to identified schools, with priority being given to the lowest-achieving schools.

LEGISLATION

Title I – Improving Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged

SEC. 1003. SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

- (a) STATE RESERVATIONS – Each State shall reserve 2 percent of the amount the State receives under subpart 2 or part A for fiscal years 2002-2003, and 4 percent of the amount received under sub subpart for fiscal years 2004 through 2007, to carry out subsection (b) and to carry out the State's responsibilities under sections 1116 and 1117, including carrying out the State educational agency's statewide system of technical assistance and support for local educational agencies.
- (b) USES – Of the amount reserved under subsection (a) for any fiscal year, the State educational agency –
 - (1) shall allocate not less than 95 percent of that amount directly to local educational agencies for schools identified for school improvement, corrective action, restructuring, for activities under section 1116 (b); or
 - (2) may, with the approval of the local educational agency, directly provide for these activities or arrange for their provision through other entities such as school support teams or educational service agencies.

- (c) **PRIORITY** – The State educational agency, in allocating funds to local educational agencies under this section, shall give priority to local educational agencies that –
- (1) serve the lowest-achieving schools;
 - (2) demonstrate the greatest need for such funds; and
 - (3) demonstrate the strongest commitment to ensuring that such funds are used to enable the lowest-achieving schools to meet the progress goals in school improvement plans under section 1116 (b)(3)(A)(v).

RATIONALE FOR CRITERIA

The proposed criteria will award approximately \$45,000 to each school of the 110 eligible schools identified for restructuring because they have failed to make adequate yearly progress for five or more years. These schools are required to develop plans for fundamental reform of their school's governance structure, with participation by teachers and parents, and prepare to implement the plans no later than the beginning of the 2004-2005 school year. School districts will need to apply for these funds using an application form and provide clear rationale for the restructuring option selected, details on how they would plan for the option's implementation, a plan for professional development that would support the option for each of the schools for which they are requesting funds. All schools must use external expertise to assist them in their activities.

CRITERIA

☒ Defined in Legislation ☐ Defined by Department's Grant ☒ Proposed by Staff

The funds will be awarded to Title I schools that have been identified for restructuring in 2003-2004 because they have failed to make adequate yearly progress for five or more years.

Specific criteria is outlined in Attachment B entitled, "Guidelines for Corrective Action and Restructuring Options." Schools identified for Restructuring must limit their professional development plans to support the option they have selected in response to their AYP status. Activities that do not support their restructuring option will not be approved.

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS/TARGET POPULATION TO BE SERVED BY GRANT

The target population for the grant is students and staff in Title I schools that have been identified for Restructuring.

TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE

\$5,000,000

OFFICE ADMINISTERING GRANT/PROGRAM CONTACT

Office of School Improvement, Field Services Unit – Linda Brown

Guidelines for Corrective Action and Restructuring Options

Ⓒ = Corrective Action Ⓓ = Restructuring Option

- Ⓒ 1. **Institute a "new curriculum" along with professional development.** This option is not merely a change in textbooks or basal series. It is intended to focus on significant change in the structure or instructional design and delivery as well as an emphasis on curricular decision-making, such as mapping and/or use of a schoolwide curriculum assessment data system to drive instruction. External reform models are acceptable, but must be used as a whole school initiative. Models must include schoolwide instructional reform, not merely a change in curricular support materials. These models include:
 - Coalition of Essential Schools (www.essentialschools.org)
 - American Student Achievement Institute (www.asai.indstate.edu)
 - Other examples are available through www.ncrel.org Catalogue of Reform Models – Whole School

All Professional Development in this option must be based on the Michigan Standards for Professional Development and include the following criteria: be schoolwide; be long-term with follow-up; include school administrator; have access to adequate funds, time, substitute teachers, materials, and outside speakers; foster agreement among participants on goals and vision; encourage collegiality; and make use of an outside facilitator.
- Ⓒ Ⓓ 2. **Appoint a new principal.** Provide rationale why this option will significantly change student achievement status (C) OR significantly change the school's governance (R). Provide rationale and a plan for alternative governance (R).
- Ⓓ 3. **Temporarily suspend the office of the school principalship.** Have the central office take over the administration of the school through the appointment of a central office administrator to govern the school.
- Ⓒ Ⓓ 4. **Appoint/employ an independent "turn-around specialist" for the school.** This person would have some limited powers over the school, e.g. in decisions regarding curriculum, staff development, decision-making process, school improvement plan, etc. Powers of this specialist could be determined by:
 - **The state**—if specialist were state-appointed and the school/district was required or volunteered to accept a state monitor.
 - **The local board of education**—if specialist were a district decision and the monitor would report to the school board.
- Ⓓ 5. **Turn over the operation of the school to the school's School Improvement Committee (SIC)** Require the SIC to submit an action plan that will commit the staff to professional development and curriculum/instruction changes. Establish a sunset date for the SIC to give governance back to a principal. Hold the SIC accountable for school improvement within this time frame.

Guidelines for Corrective Action and Restructuring Options

© = Corrective Action R = Restructuring Option

- R** 6. **Instead of closing the school and reopening as a charter school, replicate the governance model of a charter school.** Establish a Governing Board to oversee the school, with representatives of the teachers, administration, parents, business and community leaders. Have the local board of education grant the Governing Board some degree of autonomy in pursuing an aggressive improvement plan. Establish a sunset date for the Governing Board to cease to exist, and hold that board accountable for school improvement within that time.
- © R** 7. **Assign a coach to the school, from the cadre of coaches trained through the Coaches' Institute.** Coaches are experienced, active or retired, administrators or teachers. The coach would, to a greater or lesser degree, become "embedded" in the school, to assist in implementing the school's aggressive school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring plan. The Coach would make recommendations to the Superintendent of the district as to the viability of continuing the operation of the school and in what manner. Coaches would be funded by the district and/or school using Title I funds and would be on contract for no less than 100 school days (may include summer with work staff).
- R** 8. **Close the school and reopen as a complete school of choice within the governance of the school district.** The school would need to identify itself specifically by what it would be able to offer students in terms of academic programs and expected performance. For example, a focus school where a specific approach to learning is implemented on a school wide basis. This option would require a state appointed monitor/coach to assist the school in developing its focus, mission, goals, and operational structure. Monitors/Coaches would be funded by the district and/or school using Title I funds and would be on contract for no less than 100 school days (may include summer with work staff).
- © R** 9. **Use of external-based reform model.** Model must include alternative governance approaches and schoolwide instructional reform, not merely a change in curricular materials. These models include:
- Coalition of Essential Schools (www.essentialschools.org)
 - American Student Achievement Institute (www.asai.indstate.edu)
 - Other examples are available through www.ncrel.org Catalogue of Reform Models – Whole School

The cost of all Corrective Action and Restructuring options is the responsibility of the school and/or district. The Michigan Department of Education will allocate funds to support technical assistance and professional development for schools identified as having the greatest need based on State Board of Education criteria.